JAMES MAXENIER
111 White Plains Road
Bronxville, New York 10708

Plaintiff

V.

NATIONAL RAILROAD PASSENGER CORPORATION, t/a "AMTRAK" 1 Massachusetts Avenue, NW Washington, D.C. 20001

Serve On; CT Corporation 1015 15th Street NW Suite 1000 Washington, DC 20005 IN THE

CIRCUIT COURT

FOR

BALTIMORE CITY

Civil Case No. 24-C-20-005 114 MT

COMPLAINT AND REQUEST FOR JURY TRIAL

Plaintiff, James Maxenier, by his attorneys, Richard P. Seitz and the Law Offices of Peter G. Angelos, P.C., sues Defendants, and for cause states:

BACKGROUND,

- The cause of action arose fall which occurred in Baltimore City, specifically at Baltimore's Pennsylvania Station located at 1500 N. Charles Street.
- 2. Defendant National Railroad Passenger Corporation ("Defendant" or "Amtrak"") is a corporation with is its principle place of business in Washington, D.C. The defendant Amtrak is in the business of the interstate transportation of passengers, charging passengers for such transportation, and is a common carrier. Upon information and belief, Defendant regularly conducts and carries on business in the State of Maryland, and owns and maintains railroad tracks between, among many other locations, Baltimore and New York.
- 3. Plaintiff is a resident of New York state.

This civil action may be brought in the Circuit Court for Baltimore City pursuant to the provisions of Maryland Courts and Judicial Proceedings Code Annotated §§6-103(b), 6-201(a), and 6-202(8).

FACTS COMMON TO ALL COUNTS

- 5. At all times hereinafter mentioned, Amtrak operated a commuter railroad network known as the "North East Regional," including passage from Baltimore to New Rochelle, New York.
- 6, Upon information and belief, at all times hereinafter mentioned, Amtrak owned the trains and tracks between which operated as the North East Regional between Baltimore and New York, including track E6 at Baltimore's Pennsylvania Station.
- 7: Upon information and belief, Amtrak trains are operated by engineers who are employed by Amtrak.
- 8. Upon information and belief, the train engineer of train No. 197 was employed by

 Amtrak and was operating the aforesaid train within the scope and/or course of

 his employment.
- 9... Upon information and belief, at all times hereinafter mentioned, Amtrak operated, managed, and maintained Amtrak train No. 197.
- 10. On December 15, 2017 at approximately 12:47 p.m., Plaintiff was a lawful, ticketed passenger with Amtrak on the North East Regional, with an itinerary from Baltimore's Pennsylvania Station to New Rochelle station in New York aboard Train 197.
- 11. As Plaintiff approached the furthest forward entry door on the train, he attempted to board the train, stepping from the platform onto the train.

- As Plaintiff stepped from the platform to the train, he was caused to fall between the platform and the train as a result of an abnormally large and vast gap between the train and the platform.
- Plaintiff fell as a result of a dangerous defective and unsafe condition that was permitted to exist for an unreasonable length of time and was known or in the exercise of reasonable care, should have been known to defendant, their agents, servants and/or employees.
- As a result of the aforesaid incident, Plaintiff sustained severe and permanent personal injuries to his right lower extremity, and other parts of the body, and all damages are permanent in nature and continuing into the future.

COUNT ONE - NEGLIGENCE.

- 15. Plaintiff incorporates each of the preceding paragraphs as if fully recounted.
- 16. Defendant owned, operated, managed, and maintained Track E6 at Baltimore's Pennsylvania Station.
- 17. At all times mentioned, the defendant, its agents, servants and/or employees had a duty to maintain the aforesaid train tracks, platform, and train at Track E6 of the subject station in a reasonably safe condition.
- 18. At all times hereinafter mentioned, the defendant had a duty of care to Plaintiff as a passenger on Amtrak train No. 197.
- 19. Amtrak, by its agents, servants and/or employees, were negligent and careless in:
 - a. the ownership, operation, management and control of said track platform, train, and gap in between;
 - in causing, permitting and allowing the aforesaid platform and gap to be,
 become and remain in an unsafe condition;

- c. in causing, permitting and/or allowing said platform and gap to be, become and remain in a dangerous, hazardous and trap like condition;
- d. in failing to recognize and/or barricade the aforesaid dangerous conditions;
- e. in maintaining an unsafe and hazardous platform-to-railcar horizontal space at passenger Track E6 (horizontal space between the edge of the platform and the edge of the railcar door threshold was approximately twelve inches;
- f. In improperly monitoring the aforesaid place sometime prior to the occurrence:
- g. in causing, permitting and/or allowing the platform and gap to be, become and remain in a size that was inherently dangerous;
- h. in failing to take any measures to guard against the dangerous condition complained of;
- i. in failing to warn Plaintiff of the dangerous and defective condition existing thereat;
- j. in causing and creating a dangerous and hazardous condition;
- k. in failing to post warnings at the aforesaid location, which was in an unsafe, dangerous and hazardous condition;
- 1. in failing to prevent pedestrians from falling into the gap;
- m. in failing to take proper and adequate measures and precautions to avoid and/or prevent the happening of the occurrence complained of:
- n. in failing to provide effective cautionary communications on the train and at the platform;
- o. in that no barricades, signs or any other warning devices were set up and/or posted indicating the dangerous condition that existed;

- p. in causing and creating an obstruction; in failing to take adequate care in providing a proper and safe area for patrons to traverse the aforementioned platform;
- q. in failing to provide a safe place for Plaintiff to walk;
- r. in failing to reasonably anticipate that patrons lawfully traversing said platform area could sustain physical injuries by reason of the unsafe, dangerous and defective condition that existed;
- s. in failing to provide sufficient training to safety staff to identify unsafe conditions at said platform;
- t. failure to enforce rule compliance with its staff;
- u. in failing to provide personnel to help passengers boarding the train;
- v. in failing to utilize an up-to-date safety audit system;
- w. in allowing the platform-to-railcar horizontal and vertical gap at Track E6 on the date complained of to be more than the gap permitted by the applicated codes, standards, best-practices, etc.;
- x. in failing to have threshold plates installed on the subject train stationed at

 Track E6 at the time of the subject occurrence;
- y. in failing to install gap fillers and platform edge boards at Track E6;
- z. in failing to limit the gap between the platform and the subject train at Track

 E6;
- aa. in failing to realign the platform at Track E6;
- bb. in failing to remedy, properly remedy and/or timely remedy the aforesaid dangerous and hazardous conditions although it had or should have had notice thereof in view of the fact that said conditions existed for some time prior to the occurrence herein and had notice thereof of its presence, and had a duty to

insure the safety of commuters thereon, and defendant, its agents, servants and/or employees, failed to provide a safe place for Plaintiff and others to board or exit the trains;

- cc. and in otherwise being negligent, careless and reckless in the as to this train and these tracks, although they had proper and timely notice of said defects.
- 20. The injuries and damages caused to Plaintiff were a result of the carelessness and negligence of the defendant, as aforesaid, with no negligence on the part of Plaintiff contributing thereto.
- As a direct and proximate result of the aforesaid personal injuries, the Plaintiff has been damaged as follows:
 - he has suffered and will continue to suffer considerable physical and emotional pain and suffering;
 - b. he was obligated to obtain and continues to be obligated to obtain hospital and medical care and treatment and thus, has incurred and will continue to incur substantial medical expenses;
 - c. he has sustained permanent injuries and thusly has been prevented and continues to be prevented from engaging in his usual occupations, pastimes and pursuits in which he would have engaged but for the aforementioned injuries; and
 - d. he was otherwise damaged.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff demands judgment against the Defendant for damages in excess of \$75,000, plus costs, pre-judgment interest and post-judgment interest as this Court deems appropriate

Bichard P. Seitz CPF#: 0912170153

A Professional Corporation
100 North Charles Street Baltimore, Maryland 21201 410-649-2000 410-649-2029 (f) rseitz@lawpga.com

Attorneys for Plaintiff

IN THE JAMES MAXENIER 111 White Plains Road CIRCUIT COURT Bronxville, New York 10708 FOR Plaintiff **BALTIMORE CITY** $\mathbf{v}_{\mathbf{v}}$ NATIONAL RAILROAD PASSENGER CORPORATION, t/a "AMTRAK" 1 Massachusetts Avenuc, NW Washington, D.C. 20001 Serve On: CT Corporation 1015 15th Street NW Suite 1000 Washington, DC 20005 Civil Case No. 24-C-20 - 00511

REQUEST FOR JURY TRIAL.

Plaintiff requests that this case be tried before a Jury,

Dichard P. Seitz
OFF#: 0912170153
LAW OFFICES OF PETER G. ANGELOS
A Professional Corporation
HOUNorth Charles Street
Baltimore, Maryland 21201

410-649-2000 410-649-2029 (f) rseitz@lawpga.com

Attorneys for Plaintiff

IN THE CIRCUIT COU	IRT FOR Baltimore City		X
	V. 1844	SE INFORMATION R	EPORT
161.V119	DIREC	CTIONS	J. OKT
Plaintiff: This Informa		leted and attached to the con	nplaint filed with the
Clerk of Court unless your	case is exempted from the	e requirement by the Chief J	udge of the Court of
Appeals pursuant to Rule			
Defendant: You must i	file an Information Report	as required by Rule 2-323(h	.).
THIS IN	FORMATION REPORT	CANNOT BE ACCEPTED	AS'A PLEADING
FORM FILED BY: EPL	AINTIFF ODEFENDAL	NT CASE NUMBER 2	4-C-20-005114
			d Passenger Com.
CASE NAME: James Man	Plaintill	vs. National Railroa	Dotendant
PARTY'S NAME: James I	Maxenier .	PHO	NE:
PARTY'S ADDRESS: 11	White Plains Road, Bron	xville, NY 10708	··· ·· ·· ·· ·· ·· ·· ·· ·· ·· ·· ·· ··
PARTY'S E-MATL:			
If represented by an atto		7-3C	24
PARTY'S ATTORNEY'S	NAME Richard P. Seitz	OHQ.	NE: 4106492000
PARTYIC ATTORNEYS	ADDRESS 100 N. Charle	s St., 22nd Flr., Baltimore, I	MD 21201
PARTY'S ATTORNEY'S	E MAN . Feel H@lawnen.	-om	
PARITS ALTORNETS	B-MAIL: Isonz@jawpgaic		27.
JURY DEMAND? MYe		O WA ISharada	NAMES OF BUILDING
		, Case #(s), if known:	i_
ANTICIPATED LENGT			
		NG TYPE	
New Case: QOriginal	☐ Administrati		
Existing Case: O Post-Jud	dgment DAmendment	n the Asset	Core .
If fling in an existing-cuse,	skip Case Category/ Shucato	gory section - go-to Relief sect	tolk
	1	SUBCATEGORY (Check	
TORPS: Asbestos Assault and Battory	Government	PUBLIC LAW Altorney Grievances	Constructive Trust Contempt
Assault and Battery	Insurance Product Liability	Bond Forfolture Remission	Deposition Notice
Business and Commorcial	TWO I DAVE X	Civil Rights	Dist Ct Mtn Appeal
Conspiracy Conversion	☐ Adverse Possession ☐ Breach of Lease	County/Minepl Code/Ord	Grand lundPatit Incu
Defamation		Election Law Eminent Domain/Condemn	. ☐ Miscellangous
False Arrest/Imprisonment	Distress/Distrain	☐ Environment	Perpetuate Testimony/Evidence
DLead Paint - DOB of	Bicciment Forcible Entry/Detainer	Brror Corain Nobis	Prod. of Documents Req.
Youngest Plt:	☐ Forucibsure	☐ Hnbeas Corpus ☐ Mándamus	Sentolice Transfor
Loss of Consortium	Commercial Residential	Prisoner Rights	U Set Aside Deed
Malicious Prosecution Malpractice-Medical	Currency of Vehicle	Public Info. Act Records	Special Admi Atty Subpoema Issue/Quash
Maipractice-Professional	Deed of Crust	Quarantine/Isolation	☐ Trust Established
Misrepresentation	Land Installments	☐ Writ.of Conjotari	Trustee Substitution/Removal Witness Appearance-Compel
Motor Tort Negligence	Mortgage, Right of the earning in a company of the	EMPLOYMENT	PEACE ORDER
Nulsaijoo	Exception	Ocouplingcy	☐ Peace Order
Premises Unability	Distance Condo	□ EEQ/HR	EQUITY
D Specific Performance	Reisonaldieni	□ FLSA	Declaratory, Judgment Equitable Relief;
A Texic Tort		OFMLA	Injunctive Relief
O Nulsolico O Premises Liability Premises Liability Specific Performance O Toxic Tort Trospass Wrongful Death	Lindlords Cenani Lis Pendens	☐ Workers' Compensation ☐ Wrongful Termination	Mandamus
CONTRACT	Contract to the second second		OTHER
Asbestos	HOWNERS IN THE	INDEPENDENT PROCEEDINGS	Accounting
Breuch	Ouist Title	Assumption of Jurisdiction	Friendly Suit
Asbestos Brench Business and Commercial Confessed Judgment	Renti Escrew	Authorized Sale	Maryland Insurance Administration
(Cont'd)	Mechanics Lien Mechanics Lien Mechanics Lien Redition/Sale in Liou Outer Title Redition/Sale in Liou Redition/Sale in Liou Redition/Sale in Liou Redition/Sale in Liou Tenanticeffeiding-Over	DiAttomey Appointment	☐ Miscellaneous
Construction	O'Toffine Plotding Over	Body Allachinent Issuance	Specific Transaction
Debt Fraud	www. 65 Je 4 1	Gammission Issuance	Structured Settlements

CC-DCM-002 (Rev. 04/2017)

Page 1 of 3

IF NEW O	R EXISTING CASE: R	ELIEF (Check All that	The state of the s
☐ Abatement ☐ Administrative Action ☐ Appointment of Receiver ☐ Arbitration ☐ Asset Determination ☐ Asset Determination ☐ Cease & Desist Order ☐ Condemn Bldg ☐ Contempt ☑ Court Costs/Fees ☑ Damages-Compensatory ☐ Damages-Funitive	☐ Findings of Fact ☐ Foreclosure: ☐ Injunction: ☐ Judgment-Affidevit ☐ Judgment-Afformey:Fet ☐ Judgment-Confessed ☐ Judgment-Confessed ☐ Judgment-Default	Didgment-Symmensy Linbility Oral Examination Oract Ownership of Property Partition of Property Peage Order Possession Production of Records Official antine/Isolation Official and Income	Writ-Habess Corpus Writ-Mandamus Writ-Possession rder oynjent
If you indicated Liability ab	ove, mark one of the follo	wing. This information is p	not an admission and
may not be used for any pur	_		1.191
□Liability is conceded. □Lial	bility is not conceded, but is i	not seriously in dispute. DLia	othry is seriously in dispute.
MONETARY DAM	IAGES (Do not include A	Attorney's Pees, Interest,	or Court Costs)
☐ Under \$10,000 ☐ 5	\$10,000 - \$30,000	\$30,000 - \$100,000	Over \$100,000
☑ Medical Bills \$_~83,0		The second secon	Damages \$
ALTER	NATIVE DISPUTE RES	SOLUTION INFORMAT	ION
Is this case appropriate for A. Mediation B. Arbitration Yes	refertal to an ADR process ごNo 図No	s under Md. Rule 17-1017 C. Settlement Confe D. Neutral Evaluatio	rence BYes DNo
	SPECIAL REQ	UIREMENTS	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
If a Spoken Language In	ternreter is needed, check	here and attach form CC	-DC-041
☐ If you require an accommand there and attach form C	nodation for a disability w		
1010 414 404011 101111 0	ESTIMATED LEN	GTH OF TRIAL	
With the exception of Baltin	nore County and Baltimo	re City, please fill in the	estimated LENGTH OF
TRIAL.	(Case will be tracke	ed accordingly)	
☐ 1/2 day	of trial or less	3 days of trial time	
☐ 1 day of trial time ☐ More than 3 days of		trial time	
🛘 2 days o	ftrial time		
BUSINESS A	ND TECHNOLOGY C	ASE MANAGEMENT PI	ROGRAM
For all lurisdictions, if Bus	iness and Technology trac		ule 16-308 is requested,
	rial within 7 months of dant's response	Standard - Trial wi Defendant's	
	EMERGENCY REL	IEF REQUESTED	

	(a) We sharp to a graph of the control of the contr			
COM	IPLEX SCIENCE AND/OR TECHNOLOGICAL CASE MANAGEMENT PROGRAM (ASTAR)			
	OF POSSIBLE SPECIAL ASSIGNMENT TO ASTAR RESOURCES JUDGES under a duplicate copy of complaint and check whether assignment to an ASTAR is requested.			
Expedited - Trial within 7 months of Standard - Trial within 18 months of Defendant's response Defendant's response				
	TYOUR COMPLAINT IN BALTIMORE CITY, OR BALTIMORE COUNTY, " THE APPROPRIATE BOX BELOW.			
CIRCUIT	COURT FOR BALTIMORE CITY (CHECK ONLY ONE)			
☐ Expedited	Trial 60 to 120 days from notice. Non-jury matters.			
Civil-Short	Trial 210 days from first answer.			
Civil-Standard	Trial 360 days from first answer,			
☐ Custom	Scheduling order entered by individual judge.			
☐ Asbestos	Special scheduling order.			
Lead Paint	Fill in: Birth Date of youngest plaintiff			
Tax Sale Foreclosures Special scheduling order.				
Mortgage Foreclo	osures No scheduling order.			
	CIRCUIT COURT FOR BALTIMORE COUNTY			
Expedited (Trial Date-90 days)	Attachment Before Judgment, Declaratory Judgment (Simple), Administrative Appeals, District Court Appeals and Jury Trial Prayers, Guardianship, Injunction, Mandamus.			
Standard (Trial Date-240 days)	Condemnation, Confessed Judgments (Vacated), Contract, Employment Related Cases, Fraud and Misrepresentation, International Tort, Motor Tort, Other Personal Injury, Workers' Compensation Cases.			
(Trial Date-345 days) Asbestos, Lender Liability, Professional Malpractice, Serious Motor Tort of Personal Injury Cases (medical expenses and wage loss of \$100,000, expersional unit of five or more days), State Insolvency.				
Complex (Trial Date-450 days)	Class Actions, Designated Toxic Tort, Major Construction Contracts, Major Product Liabilities, Other Complex Cases.			
.,	/2020			
100 N. Charles	St., 22nd Fir.			
Baltimore	MD 21201 Printed Name			
City	State Zip Code			